

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/701,753	Applicant(s) KAWAHARA, ISAO	
	Examiner David L Lewis	Art Unit 2673	

All Participants:

(1) David L Lewis.

(2) David Zoetwey.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 March 2005

Time: 2:00pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

claim 2 rejection

Claims discussed:

2

Prior art documents discussed:

Hirakawa and Ukai


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


BIPIN SHALWALA
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant agreed to amend claim 2 to place the case in condition for allowance. Applicant agreed to include the language "when the plurality of sub-fields are arranged in ascending order of luminance weight with the i th smallest luminance weight being denoted by W_i ," This amendment clears up the 112 problem with W_i 's definition. The claims are allowable over the prior art of record. The Applicants arguments filed on 8/3/2004 are persuasive.